

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13, 14, and 16-28 and pending in the present application; Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13, 14, and 16-24 having been amended; Claims 25-28 having been added by the present Amendment; and Claims 2, 12, and 15 having been canceled by the present Amendment without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-24 is found, for example, in original Claims 2 and 12 and in the specification. Support for new Claims 25-28 is found, for example, in Figs. 14 and 30. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 11-15, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to a non-statutory subject matter; Claims 1-3, 5, 11-13, and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Yogeshwar (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,232); Claims 4, 6, 9, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Fujita (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,219); Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Bozdagi (U.S. Patent No. 6,252,975); Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Fukuzawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,807); and Claims 10, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,680).

With respect to the rejection of Claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claims 2 and 12 are canceled. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is overcome.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 11, 13-14, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §101, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 11, 13-14, 22, and 24 are amended to be directed to a data signal, used in a video device to describe frame information. Applicants respectfully submit that that Claims 11, 13, 14, 22, and 24 are directed to statutory subject matter because MPEP §2106(B)(1)(c) states “a signal claim directed to a practical application of electromagnetic energy is statutory regardless of its transitory nature.” Accordingly, this ground for rejection is believed to have been overcome. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually satisfactory claim language.

In a non-limiting embodiment of the claimed invention, source data is formed on a plurality of frames. A frame or group of frames is extracted from the plurality of frames. Frame information is described for the extracted frame or group of frames. The location¹ of the extracted frame or group of frames in the source video data is described as first information and the display time of the extracted frame or group of frames is described as second information. A special reproduction of the source data can be performed using the frame information. Source data may include plural data items, as is shown in the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 62.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Yogeshwar, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Yogeshwar does not teach or suggest every element of Claim 1. Claim 1 recites

describing, for a frame or group of frames extracted from a plurality of frames in source video data, first information specifying a location of the extracted frame or group of frames in the source video data; and

¹ Applicants respectfully submit that “location,” when properly construed, means data which can specify the object. See specification, page 31.

describing, for the extracted frame or group of frames, second information relating to a display time of the extracted frame or group of frames.

Yogeshwar does not teach or suggest these elements of Claim 1.

On the contrary, Yogeshwar merely describes that a video image stored on a tape in playback VTR 51 is encoded into a digitally compressed format by the video encoding device 50 in the compression state 102, and that the compression process is manually edited based on the picture quality of the previously compressed data in the edit state 104.² In the edit state 104, the quality of a portion of or time sequence of the video is changed by manually setting the video.³ The user defines the video segment to be edited in step 174 by selecting a time period of the video over which the picture quality is to be changed. If the user selects spatial editing, the user inputs regions within a frame to be edited.⁴

Editing does not describe or suggest the elements of Claim 1 stated above.

Yogeshwar states “the term ‘edit’ means to change the quantization and subsequently the quality of the video.”⁵ Thus, the term “edit” does not mean that the frame information describes an extracted frame or group of frames.

Thus, in view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 (and Claims 2-10) patentably distinguish over Yogeshwar. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 11 and 16-20 (and Claims 12-15) patentably distinguish over Yogeshwar for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

With respect to the rejection of independent Claims 21-22 as unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Fukuzawa, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21-22 patentably distinguish over Yogeshwar and Fukuzawa for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

1. Fukuzawa does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Yogeshwar.

² Yogeshwar, col. 12, lines 22-28.

³ Yogeshwar, col. 14, lines 18-21.

⁴ Yogeshwar, col. 14, lines 26-27.

⁵ Yogeshwar, col. 12, lines 28-31.

Application No. 09/894,321
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

With respect to the rejection of independent Claims 23-24 as unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Lee, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 23-24 patentably distinguish over Yogeshwar and Lee for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1. Lee does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Yogeshwar.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

EHK/JW/agm
I:\ATTY\JW\210678US\210678US AME DUE 062605-REVISED2.DOC